UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Case: 2:23-cr-20623

Plaintiff,

Assigned To: Grey, Jonathan J.C. Referral Judge: Stafford, Elizabeth A.

Assign. Date: 11/2/2023

Description: IND USA V. RODRIGUEZ (DJ)

MATTHEW RODRIGUEZ,

v.

Defendant.

VIOLATIONS: **18 U.S.C. § 242**

(Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law) 18 U.S.C. § 1519

(Falsification of Records)

INDICTMENT

THE GRAND JURY CHARGES:

INTRODUCTION

At all times relevant to this Indictment:

- 1. Defendant MATTHEW RODRIGUEZ was employed as a Police Officer for the Warren Police Department.
 - 2. J.S. was a resident of Detroit, Michigan.

COUNT ONE

(18 U.S.C. § 242 -Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law)

3. On or about June 13, 2023, in the Eastern District of Michigan, the defendant, MATTHEW RODRIGUEZ, while acting under color of law as a Police

Officer with the Warren Police Department, willfully deprived J.S. of the right, secured and protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States, to be free from unreasonable seizures, which includes the right to be free from the unreasonable use of force by a law enforcement officer. Specifically, MATTHEW RODRIGUEZ, without legal justification, repeatedly punched and struck J.S. in and about the head and face. The offense resulted in bodily injury to J.S.

4. All in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 242.

COUNT TWO

(18 U.S.C. § 1519 - Falsification of Records)

- 5. On or about June 13, 2023, in the Eastern District of Michigan, the defendant, MATTHEW RODRIGUEZ, acting in relation to and in contemplation of a matter within the jurisdiction of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, an agency of the United States, knowingly falsified a record and document, with the intent to impede, obstruct, and influence the investigation and proper administration of that matter. Specifically, MATTHEW RODRIGUEZ wrote a narrative report as part of a Warren Police Department "Blue Team" use-of-force report regarding his use of force against J.S. that he knew to be false, in that it represented that MATTHEW RODRIGUEZ had struck J.S. only one time in the head, when in fact, as MATTHEW RODRIGUEZ then knew, he had struck J.S. multiple times, and had thrust J.S.'s head and face into a solid wall and into a solid floor.
 - 6. All in violation of Title 18 United States Code, Section 1519.

A TRUE BILL:

s/ Grand Jury Foreperson
GRAND JURY FOREPERSON

DAWN N. ISON United States Attorney

KRISTEN CLARKE Assistant Attorney General Civil Rights Division U.S. Department of Justice

By:

s/ Robert A. Moran

Robert A. Moran Assistant United States Attorney

s/ Alec C. Ward

Alec C. Ward Trial Attorney United States Department of Justice Civil Rights Division, Criminal Section

Dated: November 2, 2023

United States District Court Eastern District of Michigan			Case: 2:23-cr-20623 Assigned To : Grey, Jonathan J.C. Referral Judge: Stafford, Elizabeth A.	
NOTE: It is the responsibility of the Assistant	U.S. Attorney signing this form to co	omp Assign. D	Date: 11/2/2023 on: IND USA V. RODRIGUEZ (DJ)	
Companion Case Information		Companion Case Number:		
This may be a companion case based upon LCrR 57.10 (b)(4) ¹ :		Judge Assigned:		
☐ Yes		AUSA's Initials:		
Case Title: USA v. Matth	new Rodriguez			
County where offense o	ccurred: Macomb Coun	ty		
Check One: ⊠Felony □Mis		demeanor	□Petty	
Indictment/	·	prior complaint [Case number: 23-mj-30285] omplete Superseding section below].	
Superseding to Case No:		Judge:		
Involves, for plea pur	dditional charges or defenda poses, different charges or a lect matter but adds the add	adds counts.	s or charges below:	
Defendant name	Cha	arges	Prior Complaint (if applicable)	
Please take notice that the bel the above captioned case.	ow listed Assistant Unit	ed States Atto	orney is the attorney of record for	
November 2, 2023	$\langle \cdot \rangle$	AM.		
Date	211 W. Fo Detroit, MI Phone:(31 Fax: E-Mail add	nited States Atto ort Street, Suite 48226-3277 3) 226-9553	•	

¹ Companion cases are matters in which it appears that (1) substantially similar evidence will be offered at trial, or (2) the same or related parties are present, and the cases arise out of the same transaction or occurrence. Cases may be companion cases even though one of them may have already been terminated.